

2019

Introduction : Patrimoine/Cultural Heritage in France and Ireland

Eamon Maher

Technological University Dublin, eamon.maher@tudublin.ie

Eugene O'Brien

Follow this and additional works at: <https://arrow.tudublin.ie/ittbusbks>



Part of the [French and Francophone Language and Literature Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maher, E. & O'Brien, E. (2019) Introduction : Patrimoine/Cultural Heritage in France and Ireland in Maher E. & O'Brien, E. (eds) Patrimoine/Cultural Heritage in France and Ireland, (pp 1-33) Bern, New York, Peter Lang.

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Business and Humanities at ARROW@TU Dublin. It has been accepted for inclusion in Books/Chapters by an authorized administrator of ARROW@TU Dublin. For more information, please contact yvonne.desmond@tudublin.ie, arrow.admin@tudublin.ie, brian.widdis@tudublin.ie.



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 License](#)

EAMON MAHER AND EUGENE O'BRIEN

Introduction: *Patrimoine*/Cultural Heritage in France and Ireland

Assessing something as all-pervasive as cultural heritage can run the risk of resorting to clichés and stereotypes, even though these very things are also an integral part of what constitutes the *patrimoine* of any given society. The French are rightly acclaimed for their fashion, wines, gastronomy, literature, philosophy, regional specificities, architecture, and café culture, to name but a few of the *Hexagone's* most distinctive traits. Ireland, on the other hand, has its pubs, its writers, many of whom traditionally spent far too much time in the aforementioned pubs, its fighting spirit, its greenness, its historic struggle with its nearest neighbour, perfidious Albion, its beef and its Guinness. *Patrimoine* is what marks one country out from any other country; it is what makes it distinctive, different, sometimes appealing, at other times, unappealing. Therefore, when the organizers were considering the theme for the AFIS 2017 conference in Limerick, the former Conseiller Culturel at the French Embassy, Frédéric Rauser, suggested it could be both interesting and worthwhile to examine how cultural heritage plays out in both countries. The view beforehand was that the French are more adept at underlining their heritage, even at commodifying it, than the Irish are, but some of the essays you will read in this collection illustrate the fact that the Irish are starting to catch up in this regard, as the country begins to attract more and more tourists to its shores and to see the potential that has for economic prosperity.

There are several reasons why Irish writers and artists were attracted to France, but *patrimoine* was certainly a significant factor in their migration. After the Revolution, France overthrew the monarchy to become a Republic, which distinguished it in Irish eyes from England. Then there was the indisputable Catholic heritage that was shared by the two countries,

although practised in very different ways, a heritage that shaped them in ways of which they were sometimes unaware. Irish seminarians went to France to study for the priesthood during the Penal Laws; the French were Ireland's closest ally in its centuries-old struggle against England and, more recently, in their support of Irish agriculture within the European Union, a goal that was closely aligned to France's own national interests. (With Brexit looming on the horizon, the *entente cordiale* between the Celtic cousins will assume an even greater importance). Strangely enough, with all the movement of Irish people to France, the language barrier does not seem to have caused as much difficulty as one might expect, because Irish exiles in general appear to have become adept at the language quite quickly. A good example of this is the writer George Moore (1852–1933), who arrived in Paris as a young man with little or no knowledge of the French language and went on to become one of the best known figures in Parisian artistic circles during the 1870s. In *Confessions of a Young Man*, he describes his excitement at the prospect of living in Paris, where he hoped to become a famous painter – he would subsequently discover that he did not possess the requisite talent to succeed as an artist and took up writing instead. Before embarking on the boat that would bring him to his chosen destination, Moore remarked:

France! The word rang in my ears and gleamed in my eyes. All my senses sprang from sleep like a crow when the man on the look-out cries, 'Land ahead!' Instantly I knew I should, that I must, go to France, that I would live there, that I would become as a Frenchman.¹

Moore's enthusiasm for France was predicated on the fact that he knew it to be a country which cherished artists and valued learning. His experience of Ireland was very different: he found the insular attitudes and superstitious religiosity of his home country inimicable at best to his artistic sensibility. He believed that he could be happy and comfortable in the type of setting that Paris would provide, a belief that proved well founded, as Moore

1 George Moore, *Confessions of a Young Man* (Glamorgan, South Wales: Leaf Classics, 2013), no page numbers supplied.

became an integral part of the influential group of writers and artists who congregated in the Café Athènes, a place he describes with much fondness in *Confessions of a Young Man*. His biographer Adrian Frazier quotes the artist Manet saying to Moore on one occasion: 'There is no Frenchman living in London who occupies the same position as you do in Paris', a definite compliment to the son of a landlord and parliamentarian from the West of Ireland.² Moore definitely made an impression during his period in Paris and he mined the experiences he had in the French capital to fuel his creative imagination.

Moore learned from French writers such as Balzac and Zola the importance of place in good fiction. Place and *patrimoine* are closely linked and many renowned French and Irish writers are known for their ability to capture the essential details of the settings in which they locate their fictions: one need only think of Mauriac's reproduction of the Landes district around Bordeaux, Joyce's Dublin, Heaney's Bellaghy, Flaubert's Normandy, Zola's Paris, Balzac's representations of Paris and provincial France, McGahern's Leitrim/Roscommon, Yeats' Sligo. Heaney once remarked that associations with place are created through language and ideology:

Instead of just identifying with one place, and telling the story of a people in that place, poetry is also able to create, through language and imagery, another place 'where the mind could take shelter from the actual conditions'.³

Taking shelter 'from the actual conditions', as Heaney puts it, is something that many artists seek to achieve in their work. Place is an essential trigger in this process, as it has within it the power to resuscitate images and memories that can open out onto some higher artistic plane. The 'other' place that is reached through art is infused with the personal memories of the writers, and thus, over time, often assumes a mythical status. In this way, art fulfils some of the same functions as 'terroir', by encapsulating the

² Cited by Adrian Frazier, *George Moore 1852-1933* (New Haven, CT and London: Yale University Press, 2000), 61.

³ Cited in Eugene O'Brien, *Seamus Heaney as Aesthetic Thinker: A Study of the Prose* (New York: Syracuse University Press, 2016), 189. O'Brien devotes a full chapter to Heaney's sense of place in this study.

soil, flora and fauna, people and stories that permeate a particular 'place' and, in so doing, give it a universal resonance.

This is all closely linked also to the evolution of *patrimoine*. A pertinent example is how readers of John McGahern's (1934–2006) fiction cannot avoid noticing strong similarities between the figures and landscapes it evokes and the people and places the writer knew in real life. He was acutely aware of how important it was to write from personal knowledge, and from everyday experience, in order to convey the beauty that can be found in the rituals of ordinary people going about their daily business in small rural communities. In creating his memorable array of characters, McGahern borrowed certain traits from local figures whom he met regularly in Ballinamore or Mohill or in pubs and marts around Leitrim. He also drew inspiration from the landscape he observed around him for several decades in the north-west midlands of Ireland. When one reads his work, one has the impression of hearing the sound of a real hammer on a real anvil: it rings true on every note it delivers.

Eamonn Wall, in *Writing the Irish West: Ecologies and Traditions* (2011), remarks that we have become accustomed to thinking of John McGahern 'as a writer of rural Ireland – of farms, country kitchens, harvest rituals, visits to Boyle for shopping and excursions to Strandhill for holidays'.⁴ The reality, according to Wall, is far more complex than this. In order to create good art, McGahern was aware of the need to distance himself from his material in order to maintain objectivity. *Memoir* opens with the following lines:

The soil in Leitrim is poor, in places no more than an inch deep. Underneath is daub, a blue-grey modelling clay or channel, a compacted gravel. Neither can absorb the heavy rainfall. Rich crops of rushes and wiry grasses keep the thin clay from being washed away.⁵

This description of the soil is deliberately designed to anchor the narrative in a particular place. It serves to distinguish Leitrim from other parts of Ireland, to show what is unique about its landscape. It is an untamed, viscous

4 Eamonn Wall, *Writing the Irish West: Ecologies and Traditions* (Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 2011), 89.

5 John McGahern, *Memoir* (London: Faber & Faber, 2005), 1.

type of topography that makes farming a hazardous exercise. McGahern was intent on delineating for his readers the scenes he observed for the majority of his life and that he transposed into his fictional and prose writing. He wanted to capture the environment that inspired his literary vocation, the people who lived there, the rituals and customs they practised. These are all constituent parts of the cultural heritage of 'McGahern country'.

In this regard, the Irish experience is very different from the history of France, with its long history of colonialism. In an interesting recent study, Oana Panaïté notes the growing popularity of postcolonial studies in contemporary fiction in French, which she feels may have something to do with the vibrancy that is currently palpable in this area and the new perspectives it offers on French identity. Panaïté quotes Alice L. Conklin who observes that the French colonial project, 'rested upon certain fundamental assumptions about the superiority of French culture and the perfectibility of humankind. It implied that France's colonial subjects were too primitive to rule themselves but were capable of being uplifted'. She continues: 'It intimated that the French were particularly suited, by temperament and by virtue of both their revolutionary past and their current industrial strength, to carry out this task'.⁶ How close such sentiments seem to those which dominated England's attitude to Ireland, with the emphasis that is placed on the 'superiority' of the colonizer and what they considered the civilizing aspect of their mission, the alleged desire to lift the indigenous population out of their ignorance and show them the benefits of doing things the British way.

Panaïté also cites Fanon's classic text *The Wretched of the Earth* (1961) to underline how differently the colonizer and the colonized view the land: 'For the colonized people the most essential value, because the most concrete, is first and foremost the land: the land which will bring them bread and, above all, dignity'.⁷ This may explain the visceral attachment the Irish have always shown to the land, an attachment that one sees in John B. Keane's *The Field* and in much twentieth-century Irish fiction.

6 Cited by Oana Panaïté, *The Colonial Fortune in Contemporary Fiction in French* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2017), 55–6.

7 Cited by Panaïté, *Colonial Fortune*, 57.

Without the land, there can be no security and there is always the threat that someone, sometime, will take the property off those who have diligently worked it. Such a fear is not always confined to the colonizer either, as Camus' accounts of the Pieds-Noirs (French colonists) in Algeria will attest. For them, the experience of abandonment by the French metropole and the antipathy of the local population led to the inevitable loss of the land and the lifestyle they had cultivated, often by dint of hard work and personal hardship.

In considering *patrimoine* as it is presented in this collection, therefore, it is important to be cognizant of how different the concept is in a huge country like France, whose significant presence in Africa, Canada, Asia, the United States, the Pacific and other colonial outposts has led to the development of an international multicultural identity which can at times be unstable and volatile, as the terrorist attacks in France have shown in recent times. While Irish culture has undoubtedly been changed by the spectacular economic growth of the Celtic Tiger and the subsequent crash, by the concomitant decline of the influence of the Catholic Church, by the influx of a large number of immigrants, it could not claim to resemble France in too many ways. Our diaspora, while extensive, could never rival French implantation and inculturation in various parts of the world. French *patrimoine* is made up of many cultures and many parts; the vast Francophonie movement has deep tentacles in virtually every continent.

The essays you will read show the rich diversity of cultural heritage that one encounters in both countries. The opening part, entitled 'Coming to Terms with *Patrimoine*', begins with Eugene O'Brien's deconstruction of the chosen theme of the book. He takes the terms 'Heritage, inheritance, patrimony, *dúchas*' as cognates that are used to describe the largely unwritten but strongly ideologically felt notions that we have of our socio-historical cultural community. The chapter probes how, in this the decade of commemorations, the modalities of these notions are passed on, and how we as citizens of Ireland are interpellated as people who share an Irish patrimony or sense of cultural heritage. Using Pierre Bourdieu's notions of the *doxa*, where 'a state of immediate adherence that is established in practice between a *habitus* and the field to which it is attuned', and developing these to show how a *doxa* can become part of our unconscious view of the world, this

chapter traces how aspects of Irish heritage became doxological. It goes on to examine aspects of Irish patrimony and explore how the doxological and uncritical reading of this has led to current societal and cultural problems like the credit crash, the bank bailout and the many scandals involving the systemic abuse of children by Church-related organizations. The systemic responses to these issues will be traced to a monological reading of heritage, and a different perspective will be traced therefrom.

Eóin Flannery's chapter provides a nuanced analysis of how notions of debt form part, in the words of Margaret Atwood, 'of the elaborate imaginative construct that is human society'. In Flannery's view, there is a close link between cultural inheritance and indebtedness. Focusing initially on the heritage industry, this chapter illustrates how art can at times be subjected to economic imperatives that really should not form part of its remit. Flannery takes issue with the readings of certain academics who saw some positive aspects to the recent prominence of Irish literature, music and dance on the world stage, because of the prestige and financial gain it brought the artists. The link between cultural vibrancy and economic wealth does not stand up to scrutiny in Flannery's estimation, art being, of necessity, countercultural, and he sets about proving his thesis by a discussion of a number of contemporary literary, economic and cultural texts.

In the final essay of Part I, Harry White explores Irish musical inheritances since Independence. Part of White's title, 'We did not choose this patrimony', is taken from a poem by Aidan Mathews from his 1977 collection, *Windfalls*. White considers it an apposite summary of the evolution of both the literary and musical traditions in Ireland since Independence. Drawing excellent parallels between the Irish musical and literary traditions, a task for which his position as a renowned poet and musicologist provides him with unique insights, White concludes by referring to the contrast between Ireland's assiduous cultivation of European literary genres and her disavowal of Europe's musical genres, which 'throws the question of musical patrimony into sharp relief'.

The second part, 'Tourism and Culture', contains an essay by Tony Kiely on the influence of the French Huguenots on Ireland's banking, built environment, commerce and culture. Kiely concludes that Ireland would seem to have adopted 'a blinkered or conditional approach to celebrating

our Huguenot inflected heritage', a fact that risks missing out on the potential that this heritage contains from a cultural and even tourism perspective. Catherine Maignant's chapter deals with the reification of Sceilg Mhicíl, off the coast of Kerry, one of the rare Irish inclusions on the list of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites. Maignant questions whether ancient sites should be protected by making them into museums or places that are not open to visitors, or if they should be reinvigorated by allowing access to them through technology or other means, which could possibly lead to reification. Comparing Skellig Michael Island to Mont St Michel leads Maignant to conclude that the Irish site is 'emblematic of the human mind's complexities and power', and hence, an integral part of Gaelic heritage.

Déborah Vandewoude's contribution looks at faith-based tourism in France and Ireland. Religion is recognized as having been the driving force of the earliest tourism, with holy sites like Rome and Jerusalem being the main destinations. Irish people were, and still are, very devoted to Lourdes, and Vandewoude argues that this should make them more aware of the possibilities of attracting larger numbers of tourists to what she describes as 'an underdeveloped market', by learning from French marketing techniques and the development of proper infrastructure.

Part III contains chapters dealing with the iconic brand Guinness, the attractions of the traditional family butcher shop, and the phenomenal success of the Kerrygold brand in Germany. Each of the three products mentioned owes much of its success to how it is linked to Ireland's cultural heritage. Patricia Medcalf shows how Guinness advertising during the 1980s, a depressing decade in Irish history, with record emigration and mounting unemployment, chose to emphasize the positives, with campaigns that linked its product to success and pleasure by using sporting figures, singers, Concorde, the fastest airplane of its time, in order to help people to rise out of the gloom that was enveloping the country. Because of its close associations with Irishness, there is a sense in which the brand was using the known resilience of Irish people, their ability to pull themselves out of the mire, to promote its product. Brian Murphy uses the example of his own family's traditional butcher shop to show how such a model, in an age of globalization, might well enjoy renewed success. He argues that the 'authentic' family butcher shop in Ireland 'can exploit its cultural

heritage as a traditional gastronomic entity to capitalize on its associated sense of *patrimoine*.⁷ Finally, Julien Guillaumond remarks on the strong presence of Kerrygold butter in German supermarkets. The brand has attained 'iconic' status in Germany, with weekly sales of 3 million packs in 2016. Guillaumond muses on why Irish butter, which does not really exemplify Irish culture, assumes the badge of Irish identity through Kerrygold for many Germans. He concludes that Kerrygold have managed to shape conceptions of Ireland by 'presenting a country's identity in a manner that conforms to the image people have abroad of their country'. It is significant that, while only a small number of German people visit Ireland, those who have done so and plan to do so, have an image of the country that has been mediated to them through the ads they have seen for Kerrygold.

The final part deals with literature and *patrimoine*. Maguy Pernot-Deschamps highlights the experience of emigration as recounted in literary texts by Irish people in England and Algerians in France. In a time of severe economic depression in both countries, the natural destination for young (mainly male) Algerians and Irish was the nearby colonial power to which their countries had been subjected for some time. Using writers like Azouz Begag and Ahmed Kalouaz, alongside Brian Kearney and John Lydon, Pernot-Deschamps concludes that the second generation of emigrants retain little or nothing of the language and religion of their fathers, while the original emigrants find themselves outsiders in their country of birth and their place of work; they are people who no longer have a home.

Mary Pierse uses the example of George Moore to show *patrimoine* in flux. Taking some core texts such as the short story collection *The Untilled Field* and the novella *The Lake*, Pearse shows how Moore 'interprets culture as enriched by contact and interaction across genres and on a wide geographical scale'. For this Irish writer, who was strongly immersed in France and all things French, *patrimoine* was, and indeed should be, multifaceted. The collection closes with an analysis of the positive reception of Irish writers in French translation in Paris. Indeed, without the success they enjoyed in France, a host of Irish writers, some well known, and others far less so, could not have survived. Grace Neville shows how certain French publishing houses demonstrated a predilection for Irish writers, who also found favour in the review pages of *Le Monde*. The French publisher,

Sabine Wespieser, known especially for having brought Nuala O'Faolain to international prominence, is singled out for particular mention by Neville, who also remarks on 'Le Monde's almost blanket praise for Irish literature', which she sees as being 'the key age-old component of Ireland's *patrimoine*'.

As can be seen from this overview, *patrimoine* is an elusive concept, but one that is germane to many of the elements that go into ensuring the cultural specificity of France and Ireland. In his 2002 study, *Landscape and Power*, William Mitchell writes:

Landscape is a natural scene mediated by culture. It is both a represented and presented space, both a signifier and a signified, both a frame and what a frame contains, both a real place and its simulacrum, both a package and the commodity inside the package.⁸

This is a formula that applies very well to *patrimoine*, to the way in which it forms part of culture and is a means of mediating that culture, how it acts both as signifier and signified, a frame and what is enclosed within the frame. You will discover in the pages that follow distinctive ways in which the theme pervades the cultural life of both Ireland and France.

8 William Mitchell (ed.), *Landscape and Power* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press), 5.

PART I

Coming to Terms with *Patrimoine*

I *Metanoia* and Reflexive Thinking: Towards a Deconstruction of *Patrimoine*/Cultural Heritage

Heritage, inheritance, patrimony, *dúchas* – all of these are terms that are used to describe the largely unwritten but strongly ideologically felt notions that we have of our socio-historical cultural community. In this, the decade of commemorations, the modalities of how these notions are passed on and how we, as citizens of Ireland, are interpellated as people who share an Irish patrimony or sense of cultural heritage. This chapter will offer a theoretical examination of how such notions are created, and will then suggest that perhaps the best method of commemorating the past is to break with the past, in order to set out new parameters for the future.

Initially, the question must be posed as to what is the epistemological status of patrimony. The *Oxford English Dictionary* gives the following meaning – an estate or property belonging by ancient rite to an institution or corporation. It suggests that the term is especially suited to use in an ecclesiastical context: 'the ancient estate or endowment of a church or religious body', and makes the point that this is especially true of territory held by the Pope. In a broader sense, the following meanings are offered:

Property inherited from one's father or passed down from one's ancestors; an inheritance.

Something abstract which is inherited or handed down, and which is deemed to be valuable.¹

The etymology is Anglo-Norman '*patremoine*', through Middle-French '*patrimoine*', from classical Latin '*patrimōnium*', which is the classical Latin

1 *Oxford English Dictionary*.

property of the head of a household, personal estate, fortune, private chest of the Roman emperors, in post-classical Latin also estate of the Church.²

Generally, patrimony or the cognate Irish term, *dúchas*, is an intangible term, which suggests aspects of cultural and ideological identity and heritage that we can feel, and intuit, but not express in any rational manner. Such patrimony can be seen as a belief, something that we feel and to which we acquiesce, but which has difficulty in being rationally explained. In the current climate, we see that a British sense of patrimony is being enunciated through the Brexit process, where an inherited or felt sense of independence, of standing alone, of being connected to Europe but of never being quite in Europe, is at the core of current political debate. One is reminded of the apocryphal headline in *The Times*: 'Fog in channel – Continent cut off'. One could see this as a natural patrimony or cultural inheritance of the British as a nation. Similarly, in Ireland, we have a strong sense of ourselves as an independent nation, which is underwritten by a residual sense of anti-Britishness, and the decade of commemorations (1912–23) would seem to foreground that, and as a result to make our own Irish patrimony all the stronger. Clearly political, social, cultural, historical and ideological issues all play their part in the construction of a patrimony or cultural heritage, and this chapter will discuss the modality of patrimony. I want to probe its epistemological status, and to see how patrimony, *patrimoine* or *dúchas* is created and maintained in cultures. To do this, I will look at the thinking of some French writers, specifically Pierre Bourdieu and Jacques Derrida.

In terms of exploring how patrimony is created, a number of questions need to be addressed, such as: Who creates it, How it is transmitted, What type of thinking is involved, How are emotional charges created to ensure that people have a sense of allegiance and belonging to their own cultural heritage? The work of Pierre Bourdieu is of use here, as he has analysed the complex manner in which societal knowledge, both hard knowledge and attitudinal knowledge, is created and transmitted. He terms the shared beliefs that bind people together culturally and socially as 'doxa'. This term refers to the unexamined, accepted and 'taken for granted' assumptions

and practical beliefs that people share about their own society. It is 'a set of fundamental beliefs which does not even need to be asserted in the form of an explicit, self-conscious dogma'.³ It is the kind of knowledge that we all know, but which is very difficult to articulate; it is usually shrouded in implication, and shared assumption, without any need for definitions or rationalization. As Bourdieu puts it, in *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, the self-evidence of the common-sense world is often non-verbal: 'what is essential *goes without saying because it comes without saying*: the tradition is silent, not least about itself as a tradition'.⁴

For Bourdieu, notions of the doxa equate with what might be termed practical belief:

Practical belief is not a 'state of mind', still less a kind of arbitrary adherence to a set of instituted dogmas and doctrines ('beliefs'), but rather a state of the body. Doxa is the relationship of immediate adherence that is established in practice between a habitus and the field to which it is attuned, the pre-verbal taking-for-granted of the world that flows from practical sense.⁵

One could suggest that this sense of identity or habitus as something that is taken for granted; it can be facilitated and developed by notions of patrimony. Important terms here are 'field' and 'habitus', and I think a sense of these terms, and of their interaction, may offer us a better opportunity to understand how notions of cultural inheritance are passed on. In this regard, it is interesting to note that in the dictionary definitions cited earlier, the passive voice was used. It is as if cultural inheritance is something that just transpires, without any active agency of its own. Such a passive reception of received ideas has significant dangers for issues of freedom and equality in our culture, and an analysis of Bourdieu's ideas may help us to understand why this is actually untrue, and why acts of reflective thinking, or *metanoia*,

3 Pierre Bourdieu, *Pascalian Meditations*, trans. Richard Nice (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 16.

4 Pierre Bourdieu, *Outline of a Theory of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1977), 167. Italics original.

5 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Logic of Practice*, trans. Richard Nice (Cambridge: Polity, 1990b), 68.

are crucial if such passivity and acquiescence is to be avoided. Looking at cultural knowledge, he speaks of it as part of a cultural field. For Bourdieu,

a cultural field is defined as a series of institutions, rules, rituals, conventions, categories, designations, appointments and titles which constitute an objective hierarchy, and which produce and authorise certain discourses and activities.⁶

However, these do not exist together in a smooth or hierarchical organization, but rather, are formed by interactions of these different elements and by conflict between them. This is a dynamic and not a static process: 'cultural fields, that is, are made up not simply of institutions and rules, but of the interactions between institutions, rules and practices'.⁷ Therefore, he is looking at a fluid structure, wherein agents are pushed and pulled between varying values within the field. Fields are often governed by ruling principles; for example, he suggested that cultural and economic capital operated as two hierarchized poles in a social field, which: 'worked a little like a magnetic field, with positions determined by their relationship to the two poles'.⁸ The field, then, is like the rules of the game that is 'much more fluid and complex than any game that one might ever design'.⁹

His other concept, 'habitus', speaks of the 'constraint of social conditions and conditionings, right in the very heart of the "subject"';¹⁰ it is 'social life incorporated, and thus individuated';¹¹ it is 'as society written into the body, into the biological individual'.¹² He sees it as a way of explaining how an individual is both conditioned by society, while at the same time contributing to the changes in that society. Different fields all contribute to the nature of the habitus: thus in an academic field, the rules

6 Jen Webb, Tony Schirato and Geoff Danaher, *Understanding Bourdieu* (London: Sage Publications, 2002), 21.

7 Webb, Schirato and Danaher, *Understanding Bourdieu*, 22.

8 Michael Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Stocksfield: Acumen, 2008), 71.

9 Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 104.

10 Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice*, 21.

11 Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice*, 37.

12 Bourdieu, *Logic of Practice*, 63.

of the game include teaching, publishing, service at meetings, but at a more unconscious level, having the 'correct' attitudes, namely certain middle-class liberal values that are not written down, but would be expected of any initiate into the system. Similarly, an artistic habitus 'disposes the individual artist to certain activities and perspectives that express the culturally and historically constituted values of the artistic field'.¹³

The habitus is a way of elucidating how an individual assimilates the rules of the game, or of the very different games we play, in the complex postmodern world which we inhabit. It is 'a structuring structure, which organises practices and the perception of practices',¹⁴ and it describes the way structures are embedded in an individual, and indeed a collective of individuals, so that they structure the individual as a person in a culture as well as internalizing external structures.

The relationship between fields and the habitus is crucial to Bourdieu's understanding of how society operates, and to my own investigations on the modality and epistemic structure of patrimony and cultural heritage. If the field is the rules of the game, then the habitus is 'the feel for the game'; it is the social game 'embodied and turned into a second nature. Nothing is simultaneously freer and more constrained than the action of the good player'.¹⁵ He means free in the sense that he or she has internalized the rules, and is able to be creative within them; he means constrained in the sense that the rules have now become so internalized that there is not even a possibility that one may transgress them – a professional soccer player would not even think of picking up the ball and running with it, nor would a rugby player ever attempt to head the ball. In the first case, it is a formal rule; in the second, while there is no rule in rugby against heading the ball, the habitus of the rugby player would never countenance it. As Bourdieu puts it tellingly: 'the habitus is that unchosen principle of so many choices'.¹⁶

13 Webb, Shapiro and Danaher, *Understanding Bourdieu*, xii–xiii.

14 Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*, trans. Richard Nice (London: Routledge, 1984), 171.

15 Pierre Bourdieu, *In Other Words: Essays Towards a Reflexive Sociology*, trans. Matthew Adamson (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990a), 63.

16 Bourdieu, *In Other Words*, 14.

Thus, when field and habitus come together, they constitute 'a dialectic through which specific practices produce and reproduce the social world that at the same time is making them';¹⁷ when they are imbricated with each other, what is produced is a doxa, which takes us back to our initial point. Doxa relates to what is taken for granted, to 'what cannot be said for lack of an available discourse',¹⁸ and it produces a 'misrecognized unconditional allegiance to the "rules of the game" on the part of social agents with a similar *habitus*'.¹⁹ Thus, our sense of cultural heritage or patrimony can be seen to be a creation of different fields, which in turn shapes our habituses, which in turn creates our doxic position. Therefore, if patrimony is a culturally accepted doxa, the key point for Bourdieu is that this is created at some stage before becoming reified, so there are opportunities to shape patrimony or our sense of dúchas: these are culturally dependent constructions, which are subject to change.

Thus, any doxic position is open to critique, and thence to alteration, and if we trace the connections between doxa, field and habitus, we can come to a fuller understanding of this, and in this chapter, the commemoration of the 1916 Easter Rising in 2016 will be taken as something of a case study. Looking at our commemorations, the reminiscences of 1916 were an example of this. We remember 1916 as a sacrificial gesture made in the name of nationhood, and it was remembered as such. Thousands of people came to Dublin and attended the commemorations, which in turn made this act central to what might be termed an Irish habitus as our cultural inheritance was strengthened by the repetitions and re-enactments.

The proclamation of the republic, which was read on the steps of the GPO on 24 April 1916, was read numerous times during 2016, and it foregrounds notions of remembrance as its own justification.²⁰ The act of rebellion is located in the context of mythic remembrance: 'Irishmen and Irishwomen: In the name of God and of the dead generations from which

17 Michael Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts* (Stocksfield: Acumen, 2008), 75.

18 Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, 120.

19 Grenfell, *Pierre Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, 122.

20 The text of the proclamation and significant factual and hoistorical information about the writing and drafting process, the reception of the document, and the different fonts used, can be found on: <<http://the1916proclamation.ie/>>.

she receives her old tradition of nationhood, Ireland, through us, summons her children to her flag and strikes for her freedom.’²¹ Three things are significant here. One is that Pearse is accrediting a single monological memorial thrust to the past – in other words, there is no account taken of any Irishmen and Irishwomen who may not have been keen on calling the children of a personified Ireland to arms. The second point of significance is that this act of memory is very much a performative one, which makes use of the literary trope of personification: Ireland is personified and words are put into the mouths of dead generations who may or may not have agreed with the point being made. Here, politics as a societal arena has been deftly transmuted into a familial discourse through literary rhetorical devices. The fact that the sentences are in the passive voice is interesting: rather than proclaiming that this act is insurrectionary and one that is motivated by political reasons, Pearse places this act in a series of other ones – in a way, the proclamation sees itself as just one more step in a series of steps.

The point here is that Pearse, in his telling of the tale, is using some interesting metaphors and is also feminizing nationhood in a way which can be seen as quasi-sexual, with a number of references to ‘her children’. He speaks of how the Irish people, ‘six times during the past three hundred years’, have ‘asserted it in arms’,²² with the ‘it’ referring to the desire for freedom. This is a very partial perspective, as not all of the Irish people were involved in such assertion in arms, and this brings us to the third point of significance of the oration. All acts of memory, while they evoke the past and images of people and events that are no longer here, take place in the present, and, by definition, they are performative as opposed to constative. By using the passive voice, Pearse is very much attempting to elide the performativity and the agency of his words. As Jacques Derrida has noted, across the canon of his writing, memory is always an act, it is always something performed by a human subject in the present. It is ‘the most living act of memory.’²³

21 *Proclamation of the Republic.*

22 *Proclamation of the Republic.*

23 Jacques Derrida, *Psyche: Inventions of the Other, Volume 2* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2007), 94.

He goes on to talk about a discourse of mastery as 'an act of memory', which allows for engagement with the past that permits the 'formalization in an economical manner of the maximum of things to be said and thought'.²⁴ He also makes the telling point that an act of memory is necessarily partial, as it consists of 'betraying a certain order of capital in order to be faithful to the other heading and to the other of the heading'.²⁵ In other words, each act of memory and the narrating of that memory is a performative act which has its own ideological and teleological imperatives, and the readers of this narration need to be aware of the 'heading' in which this narration is taking, and also to be aware that there are 'other headings' as well.

Therefore, the Proclamation itself, that which is part of the commemoration, is a complex act of memory, which attempts to give life to the dead. In *The Politics of Friendship*, Derrida makes the point that an act of memory in the present is the only way in which to give some form of life to the dead:

for at stake is an act of memory – this is what must engage memory in the present, in the presence of the dead, if that can be said; for however difficult this remains to say ... the dead live and the absent are present.²⁶

By connecting the ideas of Derrida and Bourdieu, it is possible to come to a clearer understanding of the way in which the notion of commemoration is one of the steps in the creating of a doxa which sees that the acts that are being commemorated are, both *de facto* and *de jure*, worthy of being commemorated. Different elements of the field of Irish identity and history are selected, given a narrative shape, and are then gradually frozen into a doxic position, which over time and through education, narrative and culture, becomes *the* doxic position. Just as most of us here take patrimony and cultural heritage to be something valuable and intrinsically good, so

24 Jacques Derrida and Elisabeth Weber, *Points: Interviews, 1974–94* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1995), 145.

25 Jacques Derrida, *The Other Heading: Reflections on Today's Europe*, trans. Pascale-Anne Brault and Michael B. Naas (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992), 31.

26 Jacques Derrida, *Politics of Friendship*, trans. Gabriel Motzkin and Michael Syrotinski, with Thomas Keenan (London: Verso, 1997), 95.

the idea of commemorating something is that, by definition, it must be of societal and cultural value.

This doxa has allowed various segments of the militant Republican movement – the Official IRA; the Provisional IRA; the Continuity IRA; the Real IRA – to claim warrant from the ‘men of 1916’. It has also allowed many theorists and writers about 1916 to play down the violence, destruction and the fact that the Rising itself was in effect a *coup d’état* by the Irish Republican Brotherhood and the Citizen Army within a much broader movement of which they were a part, the Irish Volunteers. Because the rising is seen as doxically a good thing, and because the national habitus has been conditioned, through story, history, narrative and indeed the founding acts of all of our major political parties, to see the Rising as a foundational act which gave rise to this country, then it has long been difficult to condemn violent republicanism in the twenty-six counties, and, by extension, in the six counties of Northern Ireland, as such condemnation is not part of the field.

Thus Declan Kiberd, speaks of the rising as the ‘Easter Week’s performance’, and sees this notion of performativity as ‘exactly the achievement of the 1916 rebels, who staged the Rising as street theatre and were justly celebrated in metaphors of drama by Yeats’,²⁷ and there has been much talk about the rising as a poets’ rebellion, as three of the leaders, Pearse, Plunkett, and MacDonagh were poets, playwrights, and theatrical producers. In terms of patrimony, the association of poet and dramatists with violence tends to create an image that is, paradoxically, less violent and less threatening. Poets, it seems, attenuate and soften the violence, while seeing the rising as a drama tends to foreground the performative and to attenuate the blood and guts that necessarily accompany the violence. The brute facts of the matter were that of the 590 people killed during the Easter Rising, 374 were civilians, 116 were British Soldiers, twenty-three were police and seventy-seven were insurgents. There were thirty-eight children killed, all aged sixteen and under. Joe Duffy’s book, which detailed the deaths of these thirty-eight children, and was something of a *cause célèbre* during the commemoration,

27 Declan Kiberd, *Inventing Ireland: Literature of the Modern Nation* (London: Vintage, 1996), 203.

seemed to cause great surprise, as 1916 had not been associated with such civilian deaths.²⁸ On reflection, why anyone would be surprised at civilian deaths and the deaths of children in a violent insurrection that took place in a crowded capital city, without any warning, would seem curious indeed. However, after our review of Bourdieu, it should not surprise us.

The doxa of 1916, that of a poets' and playwrights' rebellion of romantic doomed young men (women were also involved, but none of those in the rising was executed – civilian women were not so lucky with some fifty being killed), is not something of which people were unaware: rather, is it an example of the self-perpetuating epistemic status of the doxa, which as a symbolic form of power, 'requires that those subjected to it do not question its legitimacy and the legitimacy of those who exert it.'²⁹ It is an example of what Derrida terms a 'politics of memory, of inheritance, and of generations.'³⁰ To attempt to break up this doxic relationship of habitus and field, as well as their capital accruals, it is necessary to adopt a reflexive and deconstructive perspective on these issues, and it is to the notion of reflexive thinking that this discussion now turns.

Reflexive thinking is not new, but it is difficult. Bourdieu suggests that by applying reflective thinking to oneself and to one's society, 'you open up the possibility of identifying true sites of freedom' going on to see this as an emancipatory process: 'social fields are universes where things continually move and are never completely predetermined'.³¹ In Bourdieu's eyes, the business of the sociologist is to 'denaturalize and to defatalise the social world, that is, to destroy the myths that cloak the exercise of power'.³² One of the core aspects of any reflexive thinking, of reflecting on what we are thinking while we are thinking, and also of breaking with a perceived

28 Joe Duffy, *Children of the Rising: The Untold Story of the Young Lives Lost during Easter 1916* (Dublin: Hachette Press, 2015).

29 Grenfell, *Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, 122.

30 Jacques Derrida, *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, The Work of Mourning, and the New International*, trans. Peggy Kamuf (London: Routledge, 1994), xi.

31 Pierre Bourdieu and Loïc J. D. Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 199.

32 Bourdieu and Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, 48.

consensus, is the notion of rupture. As Bourdieu puts it, the first stage in analysing the field and in unpacking the doxa is '*to take as one's object the social work of construction of the pre-constructed object*'. That is where the point of genuine rupture is situated.³³

This form of reflexive thinking involves not just seeing the field as predefined and not just taking the doxa as given, but instead of looking at points of possible rupture between field and habitus and doxa in order to create a more plural and less ideologically fixated sense of *patrimoine*. It involves looking at the doxa and probing the elisions and attenuations within other aspects of the field that have been silenced in order to create the seemingly seamless narrative of the doxic position. This is extraordinarily difficult as it asks one to question the interaction of field, habitus and doxa that have made the person doing the enquiry who and what they are. As already noted, the interaction of these three constitutes 'a dialectic through which specific practices produce and reproduce the social world that at the same time is making them'.³⁴ To ponder what are essentially part of one's origins is challenging, and can be very difficult to do for both an individual, and for a society like Ireland. However, to interrogate the *patrimoine* of which one is a part is necessary if that *patrimoine* is to be more broad and enabling and open to the future, as opposed to being trammelled and constricted by the past. Instead of having what has been termed an unconditional allegiance to the 'rules of the game', this kind of reflexive thinking questions the rules of the game as a way of making the game better and more fit for purpose. It also means that there is a realization that rules of any game are created and contextually bound, and therefore are not frozen in any form of messianic time, but rather are based in historical time, and thus are subject to change.

Hence, thinking reflexively on notions of inheritance, of the imbrication of doxa, habitus and field, involves holding up to critique structures, both conscious and unconscious, which have influenced to a significant extent, the person who is enacting the critical reflection. The process of such thinking is dialectical, aporetic, problematic and fraught with

33 Bourdieu and Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, 219. Italics in original.

34 Grenfell, *Bourdieu: Key Concepts*, p. 75.

difficulty, as one is moving out of the familiar and comforting realm of binary oppositions (the Easter rising was foundational to our democratic state/the Easter Rising created the Provisional IRA). These positions of supporter versus revisionist are comforting and comfortable. In discussions about the Easter Rising held during the commemoration period, it quickly became obvious that people were either very much in favour of the Rising as a foundational event, or else extremely critical of it, and both sides were happy to cite 'Easter 1916' by W. B. Yeats in support of their respective position.

Perhaps here, literature is the best way of achieving a form of reflexive thinking, as in this poem, Yeats offers both praise, blame and a slightly regretful sardonic meta-commentary on his own perspective on the euhemization of the signatories of the treaty from seemingly occasional players in what he terms 'the casual comedy' to become mythic and foundational figures of an Ireland where:

All changed, changed utterly
A terrible beauty is born.³⁵

This refrain is generally seen as a celebration of the Rising, by associating the transcendental aesthetic category of beauty with the political and military events of the Rising itself. The central metaphor of the central section of the poem, which sees the heart enchanted to a stone, is symbolic of this.

Hearts with one purpose alone
Through summer and winter seem
Enchanted to a stone
To trouble the living stream.³⁶

A heart is at the core of every living organism, and either literally or metaphorically, its transformation into a stone cannot be seen as a positive image. In literal terms, the heart is a pump, and becoming transmuted into a stone means that it can no longer function as a pump, which signifies

35 W. B. Yeats, *The Collected Poems of W. B. Yeats* (London: Macmillan, 1965), 179.

36 Yeats, *Collected Poems*, 180.

immediate death in the organism within which it exists. At a metaphorical level, transforming the heart into a stone has a parallel effect, as it will be an immoveable object which will 'trouble the living stream' of life and change. A reading of these lines underlines this point, as the physical stone is soon transformed into a metaphorical one:

Too long a sacrifice
Can make a stone of the heart.
O when may it suffice?
That is Heaven's part, our part
To murmur name upon name,
As a mother names her child.³⁷

The movement here is from a sense of scorn to one of grudging admiration to a final transformation into something terrible and beautiful, with Yeats as the almost reluctant chronicler of this process. I would see this poem, not as a work that avoids or evades coming to a decision on the Rising, but rather an example of what can be termed *metanoia*.

Writing about the political ontology of Martin Heidegger, Bourdieu speaks of '*metanoia*, a change of social space which supposes a change of mental space'.³⁸ He sees this as a way of thinking through the doxic givens of our vulture and habitus and instead seeing things in a new and different way. For him, reflexive thinking is grounded in the *metanoetic* moment. The word derives from the Greek *metanoiein* 'to change one's mind or purpose', from *meta-* 'change' and *noein* 'to have mental perception', from *noos* 'mind, thought'.³⁹ For Bourdieu, the task of thought is very much this change of mind or of orientation, a new way of looking at social, cultural and political constructions by taking account of how much of the perceiver has been constructed by those self-same social, cultural and political constructions. This requires that *metanoetic* moment of rupture:

37 Yeats, *Collected Poems*, 180.

38 Pierre Bourdieu, *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*, trans. Peter Collier (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991), 36.

39 *Oxford English Dictionary*.

The task is to produce, if not a 'new person', then at least a 'new gaze', a sociological eye. And this cannot be done without a genuine conversion, a *metanoia*, a mental revolution, a transformation of one's whole vision of the social world.⁴⁰

We might call such vision a 'post-postmodern humanism',⁴¹ since it does not break with the 'humanist project of the Enlightenment to seek the "truth" in things'.⁴² As John D. Caputo notes, *metanoia* 'comes by way of an unexpected turn of events, by shattering our horizon of expectation',⁴³ it is a 'passage into another order' and it makes a strong connection between the 'change of mental space' and the 'change of social space'.⁴⁴ This reflexive thinking means not just accepting the common sense perception of process or events but of looking at them from a different perspective. It is difficult as we are actually critiquing part of ourselves which is very difficult to do. This kind of *metanoia* or rupture is at the core of reflexive thinking; it changes our worldview and by extension, it changes our world. Eisenstein and McGowan, speaking of rupture, note that it is through rupture that the major paradigm shifts in thought have occurred:

From the perspective prior to their onset, these events are impossible, and yet they transpire nonetheless. Rupture is the occurrence of the impossible, when the very ground under our feet shifts in order to transform the point from which we see.⁴⁵

In his poem, I would argue that Yeats is offering just such a *metanoia* or a rupture, though in an extremely complex manner. He is both part of the reflexive thought and of the creation of a *doxa* at the same time. His sense of creating a litany of patriotic sacral figures, whose names will be

40 Bourdieu and Wacquant, *An Invitation to Reflexive Sociology*, 251.

41 Michael Grenfell and Cheryl Hardy, *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts* (Oxford: Berg, 2007), 193.

42 Grenfell and Hardy, *Art Rules: Pierre Bourdieu and the Visual Arts*, 194.

43 John D. Caputo, *What Would Jesus Deconstruct? The Good News of Postmodernism for the Church* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007), 53.

44 Bourdieu, *The Political Ontology of Martin Heidegger*, 36.

45 Paul Eisenstein and Todd McGowan, *Rupture: On the Emergence of the Political* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2012), 4.

'murmured', is part of the process that has resulted in a monological view of the Easter Rising, as seen in the 1966 commemorations which were openly hagiographical. At the same time, by suggesting that the motivations of such actions can be called into question, especially in his transformative metaphorical transformation of a beating heart into a stone, he is opening up a more interrogative and critical aspect of the field of the 1916 rebellion, as he is also doing by suggesting that the Rising may have been unnecessary given England's stated commitment to Home Rule after the war. This poem's complex contribution to the creation, and deconstruction, of a doxa exemplifies the complexity of which Bourdieu and Derrida so eloquently speak: sometime a *metanoia* and rupture can occur side by side with a creative strand of a doxa.

In terms of the commemoration of the Easter Rising, such a rupture was difficult. Given that Sinn Féin was seen as attempting to hijack the celebrations of the commemorations for its own particular doxic notions of Ireland – past, present and future – there was a concerted effort by the political establishment in Ireland to broaden the ceremonies. Hence, an Irish flag was delivered by Army personnel to every school in the country. There were celebrations in many towns and cities, and not just in Dublin. Academics and the media had a significant number of conferences, programmes, seminars and discussions all through the year, and the role of Irishmen who fought in the British Army and also the role of the RIC men involved in the Rising was also discussed, possibly for the first time in a sustained manner, since the foundation of the state. This leads towards a pluralization of response, and also to a sense that the commemoration was choosing more widely than before what exactly was to be commemorated. Of course, this process is not linear and some of the discussions were merely rehearsals of positions that were not for changing; however, different aspects of the field were certainly being enunciated and this, in itself, was a positive step.

In any act of communal remembrance, there are choices to be made, and these choices are often governed, consciously or unconsciously, by the doxa and habitus of the people making the choice. Very often, it is not a case of deliberately excluding members of the RIC and British Army, who were Irish, from the commemorations: rather is it that through the doxa

and habitus, they just do not come into the argument at all. To refer back to Bourdieu, it goes without saying that doxically, these groups have no place in any commemoration of Easter 1916. It is as if they just are not part of the field from which the commemorative elements are to be chosen. If there is to be any form of rupture or *metanoia*, then such thinking needs to be interrupted and reoriented: it is impossible to allow for the ground to shift under one's intellectual position if that position is always already deeply entrenched and fortified.

To enable the 'occurrence of the impossible, when the very ground under our feet shifts in order to transform the point from which we see', there needs to be a different kind of thinking; we need to look, not at the Irish/British binary or the value-laden one of whether the Rising was a good thing for Ireland or not. We need to in some way dislodge the habitus, that 'unspoken principle of so many choices' and open up other principles of choice. We need to broaden the relational range and scope of our thinking in terms of commemoration, and to create a field of reflexive thought that will cause a redefinition of the whole notion of commemoration and what it is that we commemorate.

As an example of this, I would like to conclude with an article by Fintan O'Toole, who looks at the life of a boy born in 1916. He was not the subject of a commemoration, nor was his name read out at any of the ceremonies. His name was Peter Tyrrell:

Is it bad manners, in this week of commemoration, to think about a kid born in Ireland in 1916, a real child of the nation? I can't help thinking of one particular nobody. He was so much a nobody that when he set himself on fire on Hampstead Heath in London the year after the vainglorious 50th anniversary commemorations of the Rising, there was nobody to claim his body.⁴⁶

This is a *metanoetic* moment in terms of revival, as O'Toole is linking this man's self-immolation, a gesture that to those of us of a certain age will always recall the suicide by fire of a Buddhist monks in Vietnam, an image relayed by television camera across the world, and an image

46 Fintan O'Toole, 'We should not replace one form of forgetting with another', *The Irish Times*, 29 March 2016.

which left a lasting impression on anyone who saw it. Thích Quảng Đức was the Vietnamese Mahayana Buddhist monk who burned himself to death at a busy Saigon road intersection on 11 June 1963. Quảng Đức was protesting against the persecution of Buddhists by the South Vietnamese government led by Ngô Đình Diệm. Peter Tyrrell was no such posthumous media icon; his death by fire in London in 1966 can be seen as a highly ironic counterpoint to the hagiographic commemorations of Easter 1916. Commemorations, by definition, are celebrations: they offer to public memory in the present chosen acts from the past that are deemed worthy of being remembered and celebrated. Tyrrell's suicide is something that would not have fitted into this doxa, especially in Catholic Ireland, where suicide was, and to a certain extent still is, seen as shameful and something that should not be spoken about, let alone commemorated.

O'Toole describes the life of this man, who was born in 1916 on a small farm near Ahascragh, Co. Galway. He was one of ten children and was taken into state care in January 1924, and they were sent to the 'notorious industrial school in Letterfrack'. O'Toole makes the significant point that though the school was run by the Christian Brothers, 'it is important to remember that Peter was a child of the State. It was the State that used its new independence to send him to hell'.⁴⁷ O'Toole goes on to describe this man's life in Letterfrack, where beatings and abuse were the norm. In letters he sent to Senator Owen Sheehy Skeffington, in the 1950s, later edited by Diarmuid Whelan and published as *Founded on Fear*, Tyrrell spoke of the horrors of this place and of the abuse, paedophilia and grooming that took place:

Tyrrell joined the British army during the Second World War and was captured by the Germans. He writes: 'Life here in Stalag 11B Fallingsbostel during the last months of the war is hard and unpleasant. Yet it is heaven on Earth compared to my life' at Letterfrack.⁴⁸

47 O'Toole, 'We should not replace ...', *The Irish Times*, 29 March 2016.

48 O'Toole, 'We should not replace ...', *The Irish Times*, 29 March 2016.

Looking at how this child of the rising was treated by the Ireland that came from the rising is salutary, especially in terms of the doxa that the 1916 rising was a poet's and a dramatist's rebellion. The lack of ideals of this generation is another reading of the rising – a counter-doxic reading which sees the rebellion as a *coup d'état* within the nationalist movement, which has been retrospectively valorized by the relationships between the field of political and cultural nationalism and religion, and the habitus which the capital accruing in this field created in the citizens of the country. In July 1955, when Sheehy Skeffington (whose own father was murdered by a British army officer during Easter Week), raised the question of the vicious beating of children in schools, the minister of education, Richard Mulcahy, dismissed such concerns as a:

disgusting proceeding ... by people who are not of this country or its traditions ... people reared in an alien and completely un-Irish atmosphere'. Mulcahy, of course, had fought (very effectively) in 1916.⁴⁹

In terms of cherishing all of the children of the nation equally, this would seem to be a poor response, but it is interesting how the doxa is enlisted to suppress any questions or perceived faults in the overall position. The phrase 'not of this country' is a telling one, and it speaks to the dangers of a doxa that does not allow for any different form of knowledge practice to be operative in a society. In the early days of the state, and previously, in the War of Independence, a strict binarism was enforced: one was with us, or one was against us. In any war, such a binary opposition is crucial as it allows for a gathering and a bonding of the 'us' and a consequent demonization of the 'them'. One is either Irish or British, and the term 'un-Irish' is probably the worst insult that can be hurled in this type of intellectual milieu. It allows such terms to be used, not as descriptors of where one is born or where one is from, but as value judgements, where all poor behaviour can be called 'un-Irish' and by definition, in this doxic binary logic, all good behaviour is consequently Irish: all other aspects of the field are null and void.

49 O'Toole, 'We should not replace ...', *The Irish Times*, 29 March 2016.

This is precisely where we are in terms of Kiberd calling the Rising one of dramatists and poets: as both of these professions are gentle, creative and life-enhancing, their use in the case of a bloody revolution, initiated without the permission of the Irish Volunteers themselves, which caused significant numbers of civilian dead, softens, or at least attempts to soften, the bloodiness of the deeds done. Were the Rising to be called a Rising of clerks and shopkeepers (probably more accurate in terms of the occupations of the majority of the participants), it would lack the rhetorical flavour of the more aesthetic other option.

The aestheticization of violence is something that has long been seen as dangerous, and it has been given the name of aesthetic ideology. As already noted, to a degree Yeats is participant in this process, as he avoids offering a moral and ethical judgement on the actions of the leaders of the 1916 rebellion, and instead swerves into an almost liturgical repetition of their names, thereby enabling the process of euhemirization of which we have spoken earlier: 'To murmur name upon name, / As a mother names her child'.⁵⁰ This process has been termed 'aesthetic ideology' and it involves a 'phenomenalist reduction of the linguistic to the sensually empirical, a confusing of mind and world, sign and thing, cognition and percept' and by repressing the contingent relationship between 'the spheres of language and the real', and is in danger of converting the accidents of meaning to organic natural process in the characteristic manner of ideological thought'.⁵¹ As Christopher Norris has noted, such ideologies which treat language and culture as 'organic, quasi-natural products rooted in the soil of some authentic native tradition',⁵² are at the source of a valorizing of the self at the expense of the other – this is exactly what is happening in terms of the use of the phrases 'by people who are not of this country or its traditions ... people reared in an alien and completely un-Irish atmosphere', that we saw used by Mulcahy earlier.

50 Yeats, *Collected Poems*, 180.

51 Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1990), 10.

52 Christopher Norris, *Paul de Man: Deconstruction and the Critique of Aesthetic Ideology* (London: Routledge, 1988), 182.

If the doxa of a country is to see value only in certain national values, and to eschew any notions of complexity or of different, but equally valid, national values and identities, then dismissals like that made by Mulcahy become the norm. Moreover, without reflexive thinking, which offers alternative perspectives that can, in turn, broaden the habitus in question, and ultimately transform the doxa so that different strands of the field become valued, then such dismissals are only the thin end of a wedge. It may seem a rhetorical and argumentative stretch to see language connected with location as causal of atrocities, but as Homi Bhabha has argued in *The Location of Culture*, where he talks about the 'hideous extremity of Serbian nationalism', the very idea of a pure, 'ethnically cleansed' national identity can only be achieved through the death, literal and figurative, of the 'complex interweavings of history, and the culturally contingent border-lines of modern nationhood'.⁵³

This is exactly what is being done in Mulcahy's dismissal of the national credentials of Peter Tyrrell: the border-lines of identity as defined by the Irish State are not sufficiently broad to include Tyrrell in any satisfactory or decent manner. There is no sense of apology for the horrors of Letterfrack or for putting someone 'through hell'. There is no reflective critique of a state and political system which would put one person in every hundred into religious care in orphanages, Magdalen Laundries and asylums. I would contend that a doxa which sees a rebellion as partly justified because it is poetic, or dramatic, is a doxa which is dangerously absorbed with a sense of a fictional image, an image which becomes exclusionary to those who are deemed 'un-Irish'. Edna Longley has made a telling observation on this issue:

Poetry and politics, like church and state, should be separated. And for the same reasons: mysteries distort the rational processes which ideally prevail in social relations; while ideologies confiscate the poet's special passport to *terra incognita*. Its literary streak, indeed, helps to make Irish Nationalism more a theology than an ideology it breeds bad politics – Fascism and Nationalism. But it also breeds bad literature, particularly, bad poetry, which in a vicious circle breeds – or inbreeds – bad politics.⁵⁴

53 Homi K. Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (London: Routledge, 1994), 5.

54 Edna Longley, *Poetry in the Wars* (Newcastle: Bloodaxe Books, 1986), 185.

Longley is correct in her analysis of the concomitant and constituent factors in the doxa of Irish nationalism. It is through acts of *metanoia*, and of rupture, that such separations can be achieved.

By looking at different aspects of the field: at the dead children and women who had nothing to do with the rising, and at Peter Tyrrell, it is possible to come to a more mature and rounded sense of our past, and to avoid doxic attenuations and instead look at the more complex, uncertain and what Derrida might term spectral or hauntological aspects of the rising. The fact that brave Irishmen and women fought and died for an ideal is not to be denied; but the context of this deed, which caused the deaths of a number of innocent people in the past is significant, as are the ramifications of an unexamined acceptance of the doxa of the rising for Republican actions in later times, down to the present day. Derrida's writing works:

to define and perpetually to redefine the meaning of inheriting without following, the meaning of accepting without repeating, the meaning of following even by betraying, and the meaning of setting to work an idea even while taking it in a different direction.⁵⁵

Reflective thinking and deconstruction allow for the unpacking of the doxic field/habitus connection; a connection which forecloses debate, discussion and critique. They allow for a revision and a reconceptualization of patrimony and cultural heritage, which is no longer enunciated in the passive voice, or handed down by the past. In this paradigm, patrimony is no longer a given, but something to be, in Heaney's words, reimagined. Patrimony, in this dispensation, is no longer something that is handed down from the past; instead, it is reimagined in the present. In this conception of patrimony, there is room for the idealism of a number of men and women who took on an empire in the name of a concept of freedom, but as well as the story of Patrick Pearse, there is also room in this emancipatory notion of patrimony for Peter Tyrrell.

55 Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates* (New York: Fordham University Press, 2010), 152.